

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-75 are active in the present application. Claims 17 and 46 are amended, and Claim 75 is added by the present amendment.

Claim amendments find support in the specification as originally filed, at least at page 14, line 25, to page 15, line 24, and page 16, lines 20-25. Thus no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 17-19, 22, 25, 29-40, 45-48, 51, 54, 58-69, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,535,011 to Yamagami et al. (herein "Yamagami") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,260,735 to Ishikawa et al. (herein "Ishikawa"); Claims 20, 21, 49, and 50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamagami in view of Ishikawa and U.S. Patent No. 5,430,496 to Silverbrook; Claims 41, 42, 70, and 71 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamagami in view of Ishikawa and U.S. Patent No. 5,018,017 to Sasaki et al. (herein "Sasaki"); Claims 43, 44, 72, and 73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamagami in view of Ishikawa and U.S. Patent No. 5,771,354 to Crawford; and Claims 23, 24, 26-28, 52, 53, and 55-57 were indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the indication of allowable subject matter and the courtesy of a personal interview with Examiner Jerabek, Supervisory Patent Examiner Srivastava, and Applicant's representative on October 19, 2006. During the interview, differences between the claimed invention and references in the Office Action were discussed. Further, claim amendments were discussed to more clearly distinguish the claimed inventions from the references. The Examiners indicated that the claim amendments

discussed appear to overcome the rejections in the Office Action. Comments and claim amendments discussed during the interview are reiterated below.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of Claims 17-19, 22, 25, 29-40, 45-48, 51, 54, 58-69, and 74 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as anticipated by Yamagami in view of Ishikawa, with respect to amended independent Claims 17 and 46.

Amended Claim 17 is directed to a digital image capturing system including a digital image capturing device that includes, in part, a processor connected to an electronic image pick-up, a first input/output interface connected to the processor, a second input/output interface connected to the processor and configured to receive a control program including instructions that are executable by the processor and stored on a card, and a memory configured to receive the control program from the card and store the control program. Further, the processor is configured to execute the instructions in the received control program stored in the memory and received from the card. Amended independent Claim 46 includes similar features.

As discussed during the interview, Yamagami and Ishikawa fail to teach or suggest each of the features of amended independent Claims 17 and 46. For example, Yamagami and Ishikawa, whether taken individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a digital image capturing device that includes a processor configured to execute instructions in a control program received from a card via a second input/output interface and stored in a memory. Yamagami describes an external recording medium 101 from which a program for an externally mounted risk CPU 701 may be transferred. However, as discussed during the interview, Yamagami fails to teach or suggest a processor in a digital image capturing device that is configured to execute instructions received from the card. Further, as noted in the Office Action and as discussed during the interview, Ishikawa fails to teach or suggest a processor configured to execute instructions received from a card. Accordingly, Applicant

respectfully submits that Ishikawa and Yamagami fail to teach or suggest a digital image capturing device that includes a processor “configured to execute the instructions in the received control program stored in the memory and received from the card,” as recited in independent Claim 17 and as similarly recited in independent Claim 46.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 17 and 46, and claims depending therefrom, patentably define over Yamagami and Ishikawa.

Further, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Yamagami in view of Ishikawa and Silverbrook, Sasaki, or Crawford. The remaining dependent claims depend from Claims 17 or 46, which are believed to patentably define over Yamagami and Ishikawa as discussed above. Further, Applicant respectfully submits that Silverbrook, Sasaki, and Crawford also fail to teach or suggest the claimed features lacking in the disclosure of Yamagami and Ishikawa. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested the remaining rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Further, Claim 75 is directed to a digital image capturing system including a digital image capturing device that includes, in part, at least two input/output interfaces connected to the processor and at least one of the input/output interfaces is further configured to receive a control program stored on a card. The digital image capturing device also includes a memory configured to receive the control program from the card through one of the input/output interfaces. In addition, the processor is configured to transfer the control program to the memory through the one of the input/output interfaces and execute the received control program in the memory to communicate with an external device through a different input/output interface in the at least two input/output interfaces that is different than the one of the input/output interfaces through which the control program is received.

As discussed during the interview, the references in the Office Action fail to teach or suggest a digital image capturing system that includes a digital image capturing device in which a processor is configured to transfer a control program to memory through one of the input/output interfaces and to execute the received control program to communicate with an external device through a different one of the input/output interfaces.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claim 75 also patentably defines over the references in the Office Action.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claims 17, 46, and 75, and claims depending therefrom, are allowable.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 34,648

Zachary S. Stern  
Registration No. 54,719

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 06/04)